REMARKS

Claims 1 through 73 are pending in the present application. The undersigned proposes canceling claims 18, 36, 54 and 72.

Provisional Double Patenting Objection

The office action objects to claims 18, 36, 54, and 72 as being substantial duplicates of claims 7, 25, 43, and 61, respectively. The undersigned proposes canceling claims 18, 36, 54, and 72 in order to remove duplicate claims. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-8,12-15, 17-26, 30-33, 35-44, 48-51, 53-62, 66-69 and 71-73 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Chew (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0001105). Claims 9-11, 27-29, 45-47 and 63-65 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chew in view of McLoone (U.S. Patent No. 6,556,150). Claims 16, 34, 52 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chew in view of Chu (U.S. Patent 6,703,550). Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 1 is directed to a user interface system, comprising:

> a plurality of logical buttons and their physical equivalents, wherein **said physical equivalents are arranged symmetrically**, and wherein said physical equivalents map to a corresponding **plurality of logical buttons that are asymmetrical**. (emphasis added).

In order for a prior art reference to anticipate this claim, or render it obvious, the recited language and its combination in the recited arrangement must be taught by the prior art. The undersigned respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach the recited language and cannot possibly teach or even suggest the recited combination.

Chew discloses a method and system for presenting menu commands for selection. According to Chew, a two-dimensional menu 410 of commands is provided. (Abstract). Pressing and holding a menu button 404 causes the command menu 410 to be displayed. (*Id.*)

A directional control button 406 is used to change the selection in command menu 410 and scroll the display if more commands are available than presently displayed. (*Id.*)

In contradistinction to the system recited in claim 1, Chew does *not* teach "said physical equivalents [being] arranged symmetrically, and . . . said physical equivalents [mapping] to a corresponding plurality of **logical buttons** that **are asymmetrical**." The Applicants' detailed description explains that "[a] *symmetrical* plurality of buttons is a set of logical buttons . . . and their physical equivalents . . . where the latter are *physically arranged* on the device in a *multi-dimensional manner to suggest that the functionality of the buttons are logically interrelated and determinable from the physical layout*." (Application, ¶ 117). In the system taught by Chew, directional control button 406 contains arrow designations and depressing the button on the arrow designation moves the cursor in the direction of the depressed arrow. Therefore, directional control button 406 might be said to be symmetrical, *i.e.* it is physically arranged to suggest that the functionality of the buttons are logically interrelated and determinable from the physical layout. However, Chew does *not* teach that directional control button 406 maps to a corresponding plurality of logical buttons that are **asymmetrical**. Rather, directional control button 406 maps to logical control of the selection cursor on display 402 and the control is entirely *symmetrical*. Specifically, the cursor in display 402 moves in the direction corresponding to the directional arrows of control button 406. Thus, Chew fails to teach "physical equivalents [being] arranged symmetrically, and . . . said physical equivalents [mapping] to a corresponding plurality of **logical buttons that are asymmetrical**." Indeed, by teaching a directional control button 406 that is arranged symmetrically and whose logical operation is entirely symmetrical, Chew actually teaches away from the system of claim 1 that recites physical buttons arranged symmetrically mapped to logical buttons that are **asymmetrical**. McLoone and Chu likewise fail to disclose or even suggest the recited claim language.

Therefore, because they do not teach or even suggest all of the elements of the recited method, the cited references do not anticipate or render obvious the recited method of claim 1. Independent claims 19, 37, 55, and 73 are not anticipated or rendered obvious for the same reasons. Furthermore, all claims that depend from independent claims are patentable as depending from a novel and non-obvious independent claim. The undersigned respectfully requests withdrawal of the prior art rejections.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned respectfully submits that pending claims are allowable and the application in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Examiner Muhebbullah is invited to call the undersigned in the event a telephone interview will advance prosecution of this application.

Date: July 18, 2007   /John E. McGlynn/
                                                        John E. McGlynn
                                                        Registration No. 42,863

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439